A No, the part that comes from 5

Huguenot runs down the left part when you look and even now it's still not perfect. It's like a river when it really pours, it's like a river but the other people's property is on the right side.

So, my question is, could it be the time period, the same time period as when you complained formally and in writing to the building inspector with regard to work that was being performed by the owners of 3 Huguenot Drive?

A Yes, it could have been, yes.

Q How many times did you have meetings with Mr. Carpaneto with regard to this particular wall?

I don't know if I ever met him but I met him around the time of the issue with when the 3 Huguenot Road, which was-- you know, that was a very complicated circumstance because they were in the process of people building --

MRS. MULLINS: Your Honor, I move to strike, I asked him with reference to this wall.

THE COURT: The last part of your

answer is attlexed nepulation qualities

Q How many meetings did you have with Mr. Carpaneto concerning this wall?

3-SCR Document 13 Filed 07/01/2008

A I don't believe I had any meetings with him, my wife may have met him but it was not more than once but I did not have meetings, we had phone conversations but not meetings.

Q How many phone conversations did you have with him?

A Two or three, something like that.

Q Your, yourself?

A Yes, those phone conversations were was--

THE COURT: No, stop. Mrs. Mullins, you have to object.

MRS. MULLINS: I am trying to. He talks very quickly. Could we have the last question read back.

(Whereupon, the last question was read back by the reporter.)

Q Those phone conversations that you testified to were between yourself and Mr. Carpaneto; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Did your wife also have phone

conversations with Mr. Carpanskal A She may have. 2 Do you know how many? 3 No, but it would not be more than a Α 4 couple in my opinion. 5 Do you know if your wife had any 6 meetings with Mr. Carpaneto? 7 I don't think so but when we wanted 8 to get the copy of something, she may have come and 9 tried to get a copy. 10 How long have you lived at 2 0 11 Lafayette? 12 I guess we moved in December of A 13 1988, so eighteen years. 1.4 Have you ever, in the eighteen 15 years that you lived there, with the exception of 16 this present case, ever complained about this wall 17 to anyone? 18 Not formally. 19 How about informally? 20 0 If you look at it, it's one of 21 those things --22 MRS. MULLINS: Move to strike. 23 THE COURT: Stricken. 24 Only to family and friends. Α 25

| 1 | Q Did you ever make any compliants | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|
| 2 | formal or informal to the Mr. Rotenbergs? | | | |
| 3 | A Not to my knowledge. | | | |
| 4 | Q To the building department? | | | |
| 5 | A Not to my knowledge. | | | |
| 6 | Q How were you made aware that Mr. | | | |
| 7 | Rotenberg was selling the house? | | | |
| 8 | A My wife said that Mr. Rotenberg | | | |
| 9 | said it and that is in our letter to him on April | | | |
| 10 | 14th. | | | |
| 11 | Q When were you made aware of that? | | | |
| 12 | A Before we wrote that letter on | | | |
| 13 | April 14tth. | | | |
| 14 | Q Do you recall how you were made | | | |
| 15 | aware? | | | |
| 16 | MRS. FIORE: It's been asked and | | | |
| 17 | answered. | | | |
| 18 | THE COURT: Do you recall how, yes or | | | |
| 19 | no. | | | |
| 20 | A No. | | | |
| 21 | Q Isn't it true that you learned that | | | |
| 22 | the house was being listed for sale and you took | | | |
| 23 | the opportunity to have an attempt to have | | | |
| 24 | substantial work done on your side at this time? | | | |
| 25 | MRS. FIORE: Objection. | | | |

THE COURT CONTRACTORS, CONTRACTOR

| an | SW | er | that. |
|----|----|----|-------|
|----|----|----|-------|

1.3

A It's not our wall, it's his wall, there is no dispute about that to my knowledge, so --

MRS. MULLINS: Move to strike.

THE COURT: Stop.

A Sorry.

Q The question is, isn't it true that you became aware that the house was being offered for sale and you took this opportunity --

A No, that is not true the trigger was Mr. Rotenberg asking to have a mason cosmetically repair the wall. We did not know he was selling the house.

Q But you testified that you became aware that he was going to sell the house?

A Yes, after that.

Q And after that is when you wrote your letter and contacted the building department and had all of these conversations; isn't that true?

A Yes, but we did not want the damage to the wall--

Q Yes or no?

We talk a t want the design to the wall being covered by stucko covering it. It did 2 not seem fair to us or to the new buyers, it's a 3 potentially dangerous situation. 4 You used the word cosmetic several 5 times, did Mr. Rotenberg ever use the word cosmetic 6 when he described to you what was going to be done 7 to your side of the wall? 8 Not to my knowledge. 9 You did not have any conversations 10 with the contractor; did you? 11 A contractor of Mr. Rotenberg? Α 12 Q Yes. 13 No. Д 14 Did your wife have any conversation 15 with the contractor? 16 I don't know the answer to that but 17 Mr. Rotenberg --18 THE COURT: Stop. 19 MRS. MULLINS: Nothing further, Your 20 Honor. 21 MRS. FIORE: Nothing further. 22 MR. GREENWALD: Am I permitted say 23

THE COURT: You are here to testify,

something?

24

25

that waans you say bein to sampled

questions. I heard the question and I haved your testimony, so, I thank you for your testimony and you are excused. If you wish, you may remain in the courtroom and hear the rest of the trial. You don't have to but the court is open. You could stay if you wish.

THE COURT: Do the People have any other testimony or evidence they would like to present.

 $$\operatorname{MRS}.$$ FIORE: No, Your Honor at this time the People rest.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE COURT: Mrs. Mullins?

MRS. MULLINS: At this time I would like to make a motion and renew my prior motion but on somewhat different grounds.

At this point, the Defendant's move to dismiss the summons issued in this case based on the fact that the People have failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant has violated the section 302.7 of the New York State Building Code.

Further and in particular Your

the factual section of the secusators

instrument.

That was not done certainly when it was served and now the People have put forth three witnesses and that still has not been established.

Your Honor, based on that, the Defendants move to dismiss the action with prejudice.

THE COURT: Okay, I'm going to reserve my decision on your motion for a direct verdict, which is what it is and ask you to please proceed with your case.

MRS. MULLINS: Could I have a short break?

MRS. FIORE: Before we take that break, could I be heard as to my application?

THE COURT: I don't know what you could have.

MRS. FIORE: My application is also for a direct verdict in favor of the People Your Honor.

THE COURT: You can't to that.

MRS. FIORE: There is a prima facie

case = THE COURT: Whether or not you made a 2 prima facie case, the Defendant still has a 3 right to put on their own evidence, so this 4 is not a recognized motion. 5 MRS. FIORE: Yes, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Okay, let's have a five 7 minute break. 8 MRS. MULLINS: I would like to speak to my witnesses. 10 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken 11 by all parties.) 12 THE COURT: Mrs. Mullins, call your 13 first witness. 14 MRS. MULLINS: We call John 15 Annunziata, professional engineer. 16 THE COURT: Remain standing and I 17 will swear you in. 18 J O H N A N N U N Z I A T A , a witness herein, 19 having been first duly sworn by the Court, was 20 examined and testified as follows: 21 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY: MRS. MULLINS: 22 Good morning Mr. Annunziata, could 23 you tell the Court your formal education in the 24 field of engineering? 25